

fiscal year. I notice that in the first and last two years of the administration of the Weights and Measures Act, under the late Government, each Inspector of Weights and Measures collected an average revenue of \$813, but under the inspection as conducted at present, each Inspector has collected an average of \$466. I notice, further, that during the last two years of the administration of that Act by the late Government, the expenditure averaged for each Inspector \$2,096, whereas, the expenditure under the present Act has averaged \$2,275. Instead of an economy promised by the change in the Weights and Measures Act we have something that looks like the opposite. I find, also, that the receipts previous to 1879 averaged 39 per cent. of the expenditure, but the receipts for the last Weights and Measures Act, now being managed, averages only 21 per cent. of the expenditure. It is also remarkable to notice the variety in the amounts collected in the different districts into which Canada is divided under this Act. I find, for instance, that in the district the head quarters of which is Belleville, each inspector collected an average of \$3,008; in the Hamilton division each inspector collected an average of \$564; in the London division each inspector only collected an average of \$170. I find, moreover, that in the London district the amount paid for salaries was \$1,534.70, and the entire collection of three officers in that district during the whole year amounted to only \$510.45, or one third of the sum paid for salaries. I notice that still greater anomalies prevail elsewhere. Take, for instance, the district, the centre of which is the city of Quebec. There they have eight inspectors, and the collections average \$70.56 per inspector; that is to say, the collections for the whole of that district amounted to \$564, and the salaries paid to \$2,370.70, or a little more than four times the entire receipts. In the Sherbrooke district some circumstances still more remarkable occurred. The entire collections there amounted to \$161.06, and the contingencies to \$106.94. Again, I find in the district of which Cape Breton is the centre, that there were paid for salaries and contingencies \$861.54, and the collections of revenues amounted to \$25.37. In the Halifax district there were paid for salaries and contingencies \$1,854.91, and there were collected as revenue \$440. Yarmouth is even worse, for the entire revenue only amounted to \$90.18. In Prince Edward Island the receipts for the whole province for the inspection of weights and measures only amounted to \$59.42, and there was paid for management of the office \$839.93. In Victoria the receipts amounted to nothing, and the expenses and managing the office, \$164.81. Now, I have called attention to these facts in moving my resolution that the Government might, if they have information more gratifying than what is contained in the report of Inland Revenue, bring it down that hon. members may see whether the administration of the Weights and Measures Act now is more satisfactory, either in point of revenue or management, than it was formerly. The complaint generally made heretofore was that this Act was an expensive institution and vexatious in its administration. I admit it was to a certain extent expensive, but in proportion to the expense for the inspection of weights and measures under the old *regime* the collections were proportionately much larger than they are at present. Secondly, I hold that as the Weights and Measures Act was administered heretofore, the result was far more satisfactory. Under the old system the weights and measures were regularly inspected at least once a year: as the law is administered at present, there is practically little or no inspection. I know districts that have not to this day been visited by any officer appointed under the new law. Now, the position I take in regard to this matter is this: that the Administration who made the change in the Weights and Measures Act, who dismissed, I think, 99 officers, who supplanted these with other men, are bound to give the House some explanation why those officers were dismissed,

and to show some reason why so complete a change was made in the administration of such an important department of the public service. If it is alleged that these men did not discharge their duties well, I answer that they collected more revenue proportionately than the present officers; if it is said that they did not visit the various districts under their charge, I will be able to show that the greater number of them inspected the different districts under their charge at least once a year, and I will show still further that under the present *regime* there is practically no inspection whatever. Besides, I notice, in the report of the Minister of Inland Revenue, that the contingencies of that department are extraordinarily large, considering the small amount of revenue received. Notwithstanding the fact that the officers are doing little or nothing, the department took pains to advertise the regulations. They paid for advertising in the Dominion Guide \$10, in Slack's Almanac \$30, in the almanac published by the Montreal Gazette \$50, in Campeau's Guide to the House of Commons \$80, in Burrows' North-Western Canada \$50, in a French pamphlet circulated in Manitoba \$50, in the Parliamentary Companion \$60, and to Belanger & Co., \$10, making a total sum of \$360 paid in a single year to tell the people of Canada what a great institution this is, as managed by the present Administration. After the officers appointed some years ago were dismissed and better trained men put into their places, it was necessary that they should be instructed; and I see an item of \$845 paid to a gentleman for visiting and instructing these new officers, in order that they might collect a paltry revenue of \$25 in one case, and \$70 in another, and in another case draw \$160 for contingencies and collect no revenue at all. I see another item of \$246 paid for travelling expenses in connection with the establishment of new offices. Perhaps the Government will be able to give full and satisfactory explanations of these expenses when we come to discuss the Estimates. In the meantime, I will await the reply to my motion in the hope that it will explain to me many things which appear at present to be very unsatisfactory.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman, I think, would have done a good deal of service by making this motion, if he had not made his speech. The motion, of course, is for information which the Government are quite ready to give, and which, perhaps, the House will be glad to receive. A man of the hon. gentleman's experience and standing in the party ought to know that in matters of administration like this, really there are no politics concerned. This is not a question affecting the late or the present Administration. No matter what Government is in power, it is interested in having the departments well administered. As regards the legislation, I suppose the present Government, or at least some of the members of the present Government who were in the Government of 1878, are responsible for it. The late Government did not repeal that law, but administered it according to their lights. We all know that the late Government and their predecessors were getting rather into a hornet's nest, as, by the administration of the law, they put to a considerable inconvenience the small retail dealers, shopmen, and the middlemen generally, who deal with the great mass of the people, and furnish them with the supplies which come under the regulations of weights and measures. But the hon. gentleman, judging from his speech, has made his motion rather for the purpose of attacking the Administration since 1878, than with any strong desire to get the information he asks for. He compares the receipts of a couple of years ago with the receipts now. If I read the Reform press aright, I find that the conduct of Mr. Brunel and the Department has been very oppressive. Well, if only half the sum has been collected in the way of fines and fees that was collected before the administration of the present Government, it cannot have been very oppressive. It